



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,872	09/22/2003	Takehiko Nakano	09812.0377-00000	1172
22852	7590	04/18/2008		
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			EXAMINER SHAN, APRIL YING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2135	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/18/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on 2/22/2008 have been respectfully and fully considered. Some of the arguments are persuasive and some are not.

Applicant's arguments are summarized as:

- a. Withdrawal of claim objection and 101 rejection to claim 23 due to amendment, withdrawal of 112 2nd rejection to claims 1-4, 6-15 and 17-23
- b. Withdrawal of objections to the drawings and 112 1<sup>st</sup> rejection to claims 1-4, 6-15 and 17-23
- c. Prior art of record does not teach "a registration means for...and for replacing the first user identification...use of the content" and also does not teach "limitation modifying means for modifying the limitation on replacing user identification information".
- d. Dependent claims are allowable due to dependency and prior art does not teach "wherein the limitation is a maximum number of times user identification information can be replaced" in the dependent claim 6

In response to argument 'a', the examiner withdraws the pending claim objection/101 rejection to claim 23 due to amendment. Also, the examiner withdraws the pending 112 2<sup>nd</sup> rejection to claims 1-4, 6-15 and 17-23 due to Applicant's amendment

In response to argument 'b', the Applicant's argument is persuasive. Therefore, the examiner withdraws the pending objections/rejections.

In response to argument 'c', the examiner respectfully traverses. It appears that the Applicant is not interpreting the previous office action as intended by the examiner. Firstly, the Applicant is respectfully reminded that "One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking

references individually where the rejections are based on combination of references". See *In re Keller*, 642 F. 2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F. 2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986)". Second, the examiner would like to bring attention to Applicant's original disclosure to find out what is replacing meant as intended by the Applicant. On page 24 of the original disclosure, the Applicant discloses "...In the registration process shown in Fig. 3...a vacant field, while...overwritten in a field..." From the above cited Applicant's original disclosure, "replacing" simply means in an user registration field, a second user's information overwritten a user's information already registered in the registration form and **does not mean the first user is replaced by the second user**. The examiner respectfully asks the Applicant "Is this overwritten feature not well known in the art at the time of the invention? For example, in any type of computer generated user registration form, after finishing registering/storing the previous user information and the next user's registration process always overwrite/replace the previous user's information in the registration form". Third, Ansell et al. discloses ("In step 810, content player 142 sends hardware identifier 140 and any user-supplied information to authentication server 126 as a request for a new machine-bound passport...Logic flow diagram 900 (fig. 9) illustrates processing by authentication server 126 (fig. 1) in response to a request for a new machine-bound passport made by content player 142 in step 810 (fig. 8)...authentication server 126 associates the new certificate with the received hardware identifier, within certificate database..." – e.g. col. 16, lines 53-67 – col. 17, lines 1-23, "In user-binding,...By requiring the password, the content is bound to the user in possession of the password...Specifically, the user-bound passport includes information which is expected to be carefully guarded by the user..." - e.g. col. 2, line

54 - col. 3, line 9) and further in col. 22, lines 25-48, "Test step 1308 implements a policy decision in which authentication server 126 determines whether machine bound keys can be added to a **pre-existing full passport.....a user had registered for a full passport on one client computer system and registered for a machine-bound passport on another client computer system and later wanted to move acquired content from the latter client computer system to the former...authentication server 126** implements another policy decision...Typically, **full passports are permitted to hold only a limited number of additional keys such that users cannot collect machine-bound keys and content from friends and colleagues without limitation...passport key limit** specifies a maximum number of keys held by a passport based upon key record 1704. Authentication server 126 compares the number of keys already ...in the full passport of the user to the limit specified in passport key limit 1912 to determine whether the passport can include more keys". Please note a full passport in the Ansell et al. reference is a user-bound passport (e.g. col. 7, lines 45-50) and machine bound keys is a form of user identification for requesting use of the content. From the above cited passage of Ansell et al. reference, Ansell et al. teaches registration a new user identification information, i.e. additional key and replacing the first user identification information. Fourth, Ansell et al. does not disclose modifying the limitation and the limitation can be a predetermined period of time. Lauper et al. discloses modifying the limitation and the limitation can be a predetermined period of time ("methods for updating time-limited parameters" – e.g. abstract; "...to update time-limited terminal parameters (i.e. valid for at least a certain period of time)" – e.g. col. 1, lines 43-46; "...depends on several time-limited parameters...i.e. parameters that have to be updated only occasionally, for example daily,

weekly, monthly or as required..." - e.g. col. 4, lines 23-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the content usage control apparatus of Ansell et al. the ability to modifying the time limitation as taught by Lauper et al. since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognize that the results of the combination were predictable.

In response to argument 'd', the examiner respectfully traverses. Applicant's argument for claims 1, 12 and 23 as discussed above are traversed and therefore, the Applicant's arguments for dependent claims are based on dependency on claims 1, 12 and 23 are traversed and it is not allowable. Further, Ansell et al. – Lauper et al. further discloses wherein the limitation is a maximum number of times user identification information can be replaced in claim 6 ("In this embodiment, passport key limit 1912 specifies a maximum number of keys held by a passport based upon key record 1704...to determine whether the passport can include more keys" – e.g. Ansell et al., col. 22, lines 36-48 and "...Each terminal usually uses a series of parameters...have to be updated" - e.g. Lauper et al. col. 2, lines 2-5 and "...said parameters can be updated..." - e.g. Lauper et al. col. 2, lines 29-30).

Therefore, because of the above facts, the examiner maintains the rejections to claims 1-4, 6-15 and 17-23.

/KIMYEN VU/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135